



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/297,668	05/06/99	GERSHONI	27/135

BROWDY AND NEIMARK
624 NINTH STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON DC 20001

HM22/1101

EXAMINER
FORMAN, B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1655	

DATE MAILED: 11/01/01

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/297,668

Applicant(s)

GERSHONI ET AL.

Examiner

BJ Forman

Art Unit

1655

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 144-176 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 144-176 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12 September 2001 has been entered.
2. This action is in response to papers filed 12 September 2001 in Paper No. 12 in which claims 112-143 were canceled and new claims 144-176 were added. All of the amendments have been thoroughly reviewed and entered.

Currently claims 144-176 are under prosecution.

Election/Restrictions

3. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 144-156 and 159-170, drawn to methods for identifying and producing peptides, classified in class 435, subclass 69.3.
 - II. Claim 157, drawn to a method of vaccinating, classified in class 424, subclass 184.1.
 - III. Claim 158, drawn to a library of peptides, classified in class 424, subclass 192.1
 - IV. Claim 171-175, drawn to methods for identifying and producing oligonucleotides, classified in class 435, subclass 91.5.
 - V. Claim 176, drawn to a library of oligonucleotides, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.
4. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Art Unit: 1655

a. Inventions I and II independent and distinct methods. Inventions are independent and distinct if they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different modes of operation and different functions i.e. the method of Invention I functions to identify and produce a peptide and operates by expressing and screening ligated oligonucleotides and the method of Invention I function to vaccinate a subject and operates by administering a peptide and vaccine carrier to the subject.

b. Inventions I and III are related as process of making and products made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process i.e. the library of peptides of Invention III can be made by ligating random amino acid fragments.

c. Inventions III and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product i.e. the library of peptides of Invention II can be used to identify homologous peptides.

d. Inventions V and I & IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in a materially

Art Unit: 1655

different process of using that product i.e. the oligonucleotides of Invention V can be used as probes in a hybridization assay.

e. Inventions I and IV are independent and distinct methods. Inventions are independent and distinct if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation and different functions i.e. the method of Invention I operates by expressing ligated fragments and functions to identify and produce peptides and the method of Invention IV operates by screening oligonucleotides and functions to identify and produce oligonucleotides.

f. Inventions II and IV & V are independent and distinct. Inventions are independent and distinct if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation and different functions i.e. the method of vaccinating of Invention II operates by administering a peptide and vaccine carrier to a subject; the method of Invention IV operates by screening oligonucleotides; and the oligonucleotides of Invention V function as ligated oligonucleotide fragments.

g. Inventions III and IV & V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation and different functions i.e. the peptide library of Invention III functions as randomly ligated peptide fragments; the method of Invention IV operates by screening oligonucleotides; and the oligonucleotides of Invention V function as ligated oligonucleotide fragments.

Art Unit: 1655

5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. A telephone call was made to Roger L. Browdy on 25 October 2001 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but Mr. Browdy was unavailable to make and election.

7. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).


8. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).


Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BJ Forman whose telephone number is (703) 306-5878. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:45 TO 4:15.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Jones can be reached on (703) 308-1152. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4242 for regular communications and (703) 308-8724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.


BJ Forman, Ph.D.
October 31, 2001


J. Forman